ELSEVIER
Available online at www.sciencedirect.com
SCIENCE DIRECT®
J. Math. Anal. Appl. 294 (2004) 644–654
Journal of MATHEMATICAL ANALYSIS AND APPLICATIONS
www.elsevier.com/locate/jmaa

On a dynamic fractional game ☆

Hang-Chin Lai

Department of Applied Mathematics, Chung Yuan Christian University, Chung Li 320, Taiwan

Received 20 October 2002

Available online 16 April 2004

Submitted by J.A. Filar

In memory of Professor Kensuke Tanaka[1]

Abstract

Consider a two-person zero-sum game constructed by a dynamic fractional form. We establish the upper value as well as the lower value of a dynamic fractional game, and prove that the dual gap is equal to zero under certain conditions. It is also established that the saddle point function exists in the fractional game system under certain conditions so that the equilibrium point exists in this game system.

Keywords: Upper (lower) value function; Saddle value function; Dynamic game; Dynamic fractional game

1. Introduction

In 1953 Fan [3] proved minimax theorems for a function f defined on the product set $X \times Y$ of two arbitrary sets X, Y (not necessary topologized, or linear). That is the equality

$$\min_{x \in X} \max_{y \in Y} f(x, y) = \max_{y \in Y} \min_{x \in X} f(x, y)$$

☆ Abridged version of this paper was presented in the Research Institute of Mathematics Science, Kyoto University, August, 2002.

E-mail address: hclai@cycu.edu.tw.

[1] Kensuke Tanaka, professor of Niigata University, Japan. This paper is dedicated to the memory of Professor Kensuke Tanaka for his cooperation on research projects in game theory.

0022-247X/$ – see front matter
doi:10.1016/j.jmaa.2004.03.001

holds under certain conditions. Fan's results were widely applied to many directions. By the above idea on minimax identity, we will constitute a two-person zero-sum dynamic game for fractional type,

$$\phi(x, y) = \frac{f(x, y)}{g(x, y)}, \quad (x, y) \in X \times Y.$$

Several types of game systems have been discussed and investigated by Lai and Tanaka in [9–16,21]. See also the related work in [5,17,18,22]. These games involved n-person noncooperative dynamic systems in various spaces (cf. [9–14,16,22]) and two-person zero-sum games (see [5,17,18,21]). Recently, many authors investigated fractional programming; see, for example, [1,2,4,6–8,19,20]. Lai et al. investigated minimax fractional programming in [6–8] and propose that a minimax theory for fractional objective $f(x, y)/g(x, y)$ could be applied to two-person zero-sum game theory.

Following this approach, we consider a two-person zero-sum dynamic fractional game in this paper, and investigate an existence theorem for the saddle value function in a fractional game system.

2. Preliminaries

In a two-person zero-sum game, we will investigate whether two persons will attain a saddle point in the game system, that is we want to find a value function such that the two persons can obtain an equilibrium point.

A two-person zero-sum dynamic game with a parameter θ at a discrete time $n \in N$, denoted briefly by the game (DGP_θ), includes the following seven elements:

$$(S_n, A_n, B_n, t_{n+1}, u_n, v_n, \theta),$$

where each element is defined as follows, and for convenience of the mathematical analysis, the assumptions below are made.

(1) S_n is the *state space* at time $n \in N$, which is assumed to be a separable complete metrizable Borel space, so that the Borel functions defined on S_n are integrable over such a space.

(2) A_n and B_n are, respectively, the *action spaces* at time $n \in N$ for players I and II in which each player chooses his (or her) actions in the game system. Here A_n and B_n are always assumed to be Borel spaces.

(3) $\{t_{n+1}\}$ is a sequence of *transition probabilities* from time n to time $n+1$ in the law of motion for the game system. When the two players have finished their actions at time n, denoted by $H_n A_n B_n$, then the system is moved to state S_{n+1}. Here H_n stands for the histories up to time n, thus $H_1 = S_1$, $H_n = S_1 A_1 B_1 S_2 A_2 B_2 \ldots S_{n-1} A_{n-1} B_{n-1} S_n$, $n = 2, 3, \ldots,$ and H_∞ stands for the set of infinite histories of the game system.

(4) $u_n : H_n A_n B_n \to R$ and $v_n : H_n A_n B_n \to R^+$ are bounded Borel measurable functions, and as the time n goes to infinity, they have the limits

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} u_n = u \in R \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} v_n = v \in R^+.$$

The limit functions u and v have domain in $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} H_n A_n B_n = H_\infty$. Thus functions u_n and v_n are regarded as functions on H_∞ with support on $H_n A_n B_n \subset H_\infty$ for all n.

(5) $\theta : S_1 \to R$ is a given parameter function on which the loss function of player I at time $n \in N$ is given by $T_\theta^n = u_n - \theta v_n$ and the gain (loss) function of player II at time $n \in N$ is given by $-T_\theta^n$. Then the sum of the two values is always zero.

We denote by F_n (respectively, G_n) the set of all universal measurable transition probabilities from history H_n to A_n (respectively, B_n), and consider the sequence $f = \{f_n\}$ (respectively, $g = \{g_n\}$) with $f_n \in F_n$ (respectively, $g_n \in G_n$) for each time $n \in N$.

Let $E_{f_n}, E_{g_n}, E_{t_{n+1}}$ denote the conditional expectation operators with respect to $f_n \in F_n$, $g_n \in G_n$ and t_{n+1}, respectively. Then each pair of strategies $f = \{f_n\}$ and $g = \{g_n\}$, together with the law of motion $\{t_{n+1}\}$, defines a unique universally measurable transition probability by

$$P_{fg}(\cdot|\cdot) \text{ from } S_1 \to A_1 B_1 S_2 A_2 B_2 S_3 \ldots$$

such that, for two bounded Borel measurable functions u_n, v_n defined on $H_n A_n B_n$ ($n \in N$), and for $s_1 \in S_1$ and $h \in H_\infty$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E(u_n, f, g)(s_1) &= \int_{H_\infty} u_n(h)\, P_{fg}(dh|s_1) \\ &= E_{f_1} E_{g_1} E_{t_2} \ldots E_{f_{n-1}} E_{g_{n-1}} E_{t_n} E_{f_n} E_{g_n} u_n(s_1) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} E(v_n, f, g)(s_1) &= \int_{H_\infty} v_n(h)\, P_{fg}(dh|s_1) \\ &= E_{f_1} E_{g_1} E_{t_2} \ldots E_{f_{n-1}} E_{g_{n-1}} E_{t_n} E_{f_n} E_{g_n} v_n(s_1). \end{aligned}$$

Under our assumptions, by the dominated convergence theorem and the Fubini theorem, we infer that, for each $s_1 \in S_1$, $f = \{f_n\} \in F$ and $g = \{g_n\} \in G$, it would have

$$\begin{aligned} U(f,g)(s_1) &= \lim_{n\to\infty} E(u_n, f, g)(s_1) \\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty} E_{f_1} E_{g_1} E_{t_2} \ldots E_{f_{n-1}} E_{g_{n-1}} E_{t_n} E_{f_n} E_{g_n} u_n(s_1) \\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty} E_{g_1} E_{f_1} E_{t_2} \ldots E_{g_{n-1}} E_{f_{n-1}} E_{t_n} E_{g_n} E_{f_n} u_n(s_1) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} V(f,g)(s_1) &= \lim_{n\to\infty} E(v_n, f, g)(s_1) \\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty} E_{f_1} E_{g_1} E_{t_2} \ldots E_{f_{n-1}} E_{g_{n-1}} E_{t_n} E_{f_n} E_{g_n} v_n(s_1) \\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty} E_{g_1} E_{f_1} E_{t_2} \ldots E_{g_{n-1}} E_{f_{n-1}} E_{t_n} E_{g_n} E_{f_n} v_n(s_1). \end{aligned}$$

Then, for given $s_1 \in S_1$, $f = \{f_n\} \in F$ and $g = \{g_n\} \in G$, we can evaluate the total loss function

$$T_\theta(f,g)(s_1) = \lim_{n\to\infty} E_{fg} T_\theta^n(f,g)(s_1) = U(f,g)(s_1) - \theta(s_1) V(f,g)(s_1),$$

together with the *upper value* function of the game

$$\bar{T}_\theta(s_1) = \inf_{f\in F} \sup_{g\in G} T_\theta(f,g)(s_1),$$

and the *lower value* function of the game

$$\underline{T}_\theta(s_1) = \sup_{g\in G} \inf_{f\in F} T_\theta(f,g)(s_1).$$

We call the interval $[\underline{T}_\theta(s_1), \bar{T}_\theta(s_1)]$ the *dual gap* of (DGP_θ), and say that the game system has a *saddle value function* (or shortly, a *value function*), if

$$\bar{T}_\theta(s_1) = \underline{T}_\theta(s_1) = T^*_\theta(s_1) \quad \text{for } s_1 \in S_1.$$

In this paper, we will consider the fractional dynamic game of the form

$$W(f,g)(s_1) = \frac{U(f,g)(s_1)}{V(f,g)(s_1)},$$

and investigate the *upper value function*

$$\bar{\theta}(s_1) = \inf_{f\in F} \sup_{g\in G} W(f,g)(s_1)$$

and the *lower value function*

$$\underline{\theta}(s_1) = \sup_{g\in G} \inf_{f\in F} W(f,g)(s_1).$$

Furthermore, it is natural to ask whether a *zero duality gap* exists in the game system. That is, *under what conditions* one can get a common value function for upper value function and lower value function, that is,

$$\bar{\theta}(s_1) = \underline{\theta}(s_1) = \theta^*(s_1) \quad \text{for } s_1 \in S_1.$$

3. A two-person zero-sum dynamic fractional game

A two-person zero-sum dynamic game with a parameter θ, is defined in Section 2 by using 7-tuple, and denoted by (DGP_θ). While a two-person zero-sum dynamic fractional game (DFG), defined by 6-tuple as

$$(S_n, A_n, B_n, t_{n+1}, u_n, v_n)$$

is something more hard to analysis. The reason is caused by the order of players chosen their strategies in both the numerator and denominator. The outcome/payoff, eventually, will be uncertainty. Thus we will employ

$$\text{upper value function } \bar{\theta}(s_1) = \inf_f \sup_g W(f,g)(s_1)$$

and

$$\text{lower value function } \underline{\theta}(s_1) = \sup_g \inf_f W(f,g)(s_1)$$

as Section 2 has induced. Then if

$$\bar{\theta}(s_1) = \underline{\theta}(s_1) = \theta^*(s_1) \quad \text{(a fixed parameter)},$$

it will play the *value function* of (DFG). But we will take a parameter θ between $\underline{\theta}$ and $\bar{\theta}$ in which we study the properties of the function T_θ as the gain (loss) function relative to the game (DGP$_\theta$).

In this game system, all notation and symbols are used as introduced in Section 2. Recall the state space S_n, a separable complete metrizable Borel space; A_n and B_n, the action spaces of players I and II, respectively, at time $n \in N$; $\{t_{n+1}\}$ the sequence of transition probability regarded as the law of motion in the game system; the functions

$$u_n : H_n A_n B_n \to R \quad \text{and} \quad v_n : H_n A_n B_n \to R^+ = (0, \infty)$$

which are bounded Borel measurable, respectively, and letting time n goes to infinity, they converge to

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} u_n = u \in R \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} v_n = v \in R^+.$$

For each $s_1 \in S_1$, $f = \{f_n\} \in F$ and $g = \{g_n\} \in G$, we assume that the limits of expectations

$$U(f, g)(s_1) = \lim_{n\to\infty} E(u_n, f, g)(s_1)$$

and

$$V(f, g)(s_1) = \lim_{n\to\infty} E(v_n, f, g)(s_1) > 0$$

exist, so that the fraction

$$W(f, g)(s_1) = \frac{U(f, g)(s_1)}{V(f, g)(s_1)}$$

is well defined. For an initial state $s_1 \in S_1$, we define, the *upper* and *lower* value functions of the game (DFG) by

$$\bar{\theta}(s_1) = \inf_{f\in F} \sup_{g\in G} W(f, g)(s_1)$$

and

$$\underline{\theta}(s_1) = \sup_{g\in G} \inf_{f\in F} W(f, g)(s_1),$$

respectively.

Of course $\bar{\theta}(s_1) \geqslant \underline{\theta}(s_1)$ for all $s_1 \in S_1$, and call the interval $[\underline{\theta}(s_1), \bar{\theta}(s_1)]$ as the duality gap of the game (DFG).

Definition 3.1. The game (DFG) is said to have a *value function* if the duality gap is equal to zero, and we call the common value function the value function

$$\bar{\theta}(s_1) = \underline{\theta}(s_1) = \theta^*(s_1).$$

Furthermore, if there exists $g^* \in G$ such that

$$\bar{\theta}(s_1) = \inf_{f\in F} \sup_{g\in G} W(f, g)(s_1) = \inf W(f, g^*)(s_1),$$

then we call g^* a maximizer (of $W(f,g)(s_1)$ over $g \in G$ for each $f \in F$) of the game (DFG).

Similarly, if there exists $f^* \in F$ such that

$$\underline{\theta}(s_1) = \sup_{g\in G} \inf_{f\in F} W(f,g)(s_1) = \sup_{g\in G} W(f^*,g)(s_1),$$

then call $f^* \in F$ a minimizer (of $W(f,g)(s_1)$ over $f \in F$ for each $g \in G$) of the game (DFG).

Next, we analyze some relationships between the upper as well as the lower value functions of (DGP_θ) and (DFG). At first, we state some properties for $\bar{T}_\theta(s_1)$ in the following propositions.

Proposition 3.1.

(1) *For two parameter functions* $\theta_1(s_1)$ *and* $\theta_2(s_1)$, *if* $\theta_1(s_1) > \theta_2(s_1) \geqslant 0$, *then* $\bar{T}_{\theta_1}(s_1) \leqslant \bar{T}_{\theta_2}(s_1)$.
(2) *If* $\bar{T}_\theta(s_1) < 0$, *then* $\theta(s_1) \geqslant \bar{\theta}(s_1)$.
(3) *If* $\bar{T}_\theta(s_1) > 0$, *then* $\theta(s_1) \leqslant \bar{\theta}(s_1)$.
(4) *If* $\theta(s_1) > \bar{\theta}(s_1)$, *then* $\bar{T}_\theta(s_1) \leqslant 0$.
(5) *If* $\theta(s_1) < \bar{\theta}(s_1)$, *then* $\bar{T}_\theta(s_1) \geqslant 0$.

Proof. (1) If $\theta_1(s_1) > \theta_2(s_1) \geqslant 0$, then

$$\theta_1(s_1)V(f,g)(s_1) > \theta_2(s_1)V(f,g)(s_1)$$

since $V(f,g)(s_1) > 0$ for all $(f,g) \in F \times G$. It follows that for all $(f,g) \in F \times G$,

$$U(f,g)(s_1) - \theta_1(s_1)V(f,g)(s_1) < U(f,g)(s_1) - \theta_2(s_1)V(f,g)(s_1),$$

that is,

$$T_{\theta_1}(f,g)(s_1) < T_{\theta_2}(f,g)(s_1).$$

Hence

$$\bar{T}_{\theta_1}(s_1) = \inf_{f\in F} \sup_{g\in G} T_{\theta_1}(f,g)(s_1) \leqslant \inf_{f\in F} \sup_{g\in G} T_{\theta_2}(f,g)(s_1) = \bar{T}_{\theta_2}(s_1).$$

(2) If $\bar{T}_\theta(s_1) < 0$, then from the definition of $\bar{T}_\theta(s_1)$ there exists $\bar{f} \in F$ such that $\sup_{g\in G} T_\theta(\bar{f},g)(s_1) < 0$, that is, for any $g \in G$,

$$T_\theta(\bar{f},g)(s_1) = U(\bar{f},g)(s_1) - \theta(s_1)V(\bar{f},g)(s_1) < 0.$$

It follows that

$$W(\bar{f},g)(s_1) = \frac{U(\bar{f},g)(s_1)}{V(\bar{f},g)(s_1)} < \theta(s_1),$$

and so

$$\sup_{g\in G} W(\bar{f},g)(s_1) \leqslant \theta(s_1).$$

Therefore

$$\bar{\theta}(s_1) = \inf_{f\in F} \sup_{g\in G} W(f,g)(s_1) < \theta(s_1).$$

(3) If $\bar{T}_\theta(s_1) > 0$, then for any $f \in F$,

$$\sup_{g\in G} T_\theta(f,g)(s_1) > 0,$$

and so there exists $g_f \in G$ depending on f, such that

$$T_\theta(f,g_f)(s_1) = U(f,g_f)(s_1) - \theta(s_1)V(f,g_f)(s_1) > 0.$$

From the last inequality, we obtain

$$W(f,g_f)(s_1) = \frac{U(f,g)(s_1)}{V(f,g)(s_1)} > \theta(s_1).$$

Hence for any $f \in F$,

$$\sup_{g\in G} W(f,g)(s_1) \geqslant W(f,g_f)(s_1) > \theta(s_1).$$

It follows that by taking the infimum over $f \in F$ we eventually obtain

$$\bar{\theta}(s_1) \geqslant \theta(s_1).$$

(4) If $\theta(s_1) > \bar{\theta}(s_1)$, then by definition of $\bar{\theta}(s_1)$ there exists $\bar{f} \in F$ such that

$$\theta(s_1) > \sup_{g\in G} W(\bar{f},g)(s_1)$$

or

$$\theta(s_1) > W(\bar{f},g)(s_1) \quad \text{for all } g \in G.$$

This implies that, for all $g \in G$,

$$T_\theta(\bar{f},g)(s_1) = U(\bar{f},g)(s_1) - \theta(s_1)V(\bar{f},g)(s_1) < 0.$$

Hence

$$0 \geqslant \sup_{g\in G} T_\theta(\bar{f},g)(s_1) \geqslant \inf_{f\in F} \sup_{g\in G} T_\theta(f,g)(s_1) = \bar{T}_\theta(s_1).$$

(5) If $\bar{\theta}(s_1) > \theta(s_1)$, then for any $f \in F$,

$$\sup_{g\in G} W(f,g)(s_1) > \theta(s_1).$$

It follows that there is $g_f \in G$ depending on f which satisfies

$$W(f,g_f)(s_1) > \theta(s_1).$$

This implies that $T_\theta(f,g_f)(s_1) > 0$, and hence

$$\sup_{g\in G} T_\theta(f,g)(s_1) \geqslant T_\theta(f,g)(s_1) > 0,$$
$$\bar{T}_\theta(s_1) = \inf_{f\in F} \sup_{g\in G} T_\theta(f,g)(s_1) \geqslant 0. \qquad \square$$

Next we can state some properties for $\underline{T}_\theta(s_1)$ by following similar arguments as for $\bar{T}_\theta(s_1)$ in the above proposition.

Proposition 3.2.

(1) *If* $\theta_1(s_1) > \theta_2(s_1) \geqslant 0$, *then* $\underline{T}_{\theta_1}(s_1) \leqslant \underline{T}_{\theta_2}(s_1)$.
(2) *If* $\underline{T}_\theta(s_1) < 0$, *then* $\theta(s_1) \geqslant \underline{\theta}(s_1)$.
(3) *If* $\underline{T}_\theta(s_1) > 0$, *then* $\theta(s_1) \leqslant \underline{\theta}(s_1)$.
(4) *If* $\theta(s_1) > \underline{\theta}(s_1)$, *then* $\underline{T}_\theta(s_1) \leqslant 0$.
(5) *If* $\theta(s_1) < \underline{\theta}(s_1)$, *then* $\underline{T}_\theta(s_1) \geqslant 0$.

Proof. Using $\underline{T}_\theta(s_1)$ and $\underline{\theta}(s_1)$ instead of $\bar{T}_\theta(s_1)$ and $\bar{\theta}(s_1)$, respectively, we can prove this proposition by similar arguments as in the previous proof. □

4. The saddle value function of the game (DFG)

Now we can prove the existence theorem for saddle value function in the game (DFG), and the relationship between the games (DFG) and (DGP$_\theta$).

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose that* $g^* \in G$ *is a maximizer of the game* (*DFG*). *Then we have*

(1) $\bar{\theta}(s_1) = \underline{\theta}(s_1) = \theta^*(s_1)$ *and*
(2) *if* $\bar{T}_{\theta^*}(s_1) \leqslant 0$, *then* g^* *is a maximizer of the game* (*DGP*$_{\theta^*}$).

Proof. (1) By the definitions of $\bar{\theta}(s_1)$ and $\underline{\theta}(s_1)$, we see that $\bar{\theta}(s_1) \geqslant \underline{\theta}(s_1)$.

On the other hand, since $g^* \in G$ is a maximizer of the game (DFG), it follows that

$$\bar{\theta}(s_1) = \inf_{f \in F} W(f, g^*)(s_1) \leqslant \sup_{g \in G} \inf_{f \in F} W(f, g)(s_1) = \underline{\theta}(s_1).$$

Thus, the game (DFG) has a value function, that is, $\bar{\theta} = \underline{\theta}$ on S_1.

(2) Since $g^* \in G$ is a maximizer of the game (DFG), it follows that

$$\theta^*(s_1) = \inf_{f \in F} W(f, g^*)(s_1) \leqslant W(f, g^*)(s_1) \quad \text{for all } f \in F.$$

This implies that, for all $f \in F$,

$$0 \leqslant T_{\theta^*}(f, g^*)(s_1) \leqslant \sup_{g \in G} T_{\theta^*}(f, g)(s_1).$$

Hence we get

$$0 \leqslant \inf_{f \in F} T_{\theta^*}(f, g^*)(s_1) \leqslant \inf_{f \in F} \sup_{g \in G} T_{\theta^*}(f, g)(s_1) = \bar{T}_{\theta^*}(s_1) \leqslant 0.$$

This shows that

$$\inf_{f \in F} T_{\theta^*}(f, g^*)(s_1) = \inf_{f \in F} \sup_{g \in G} T_{\theta^*}(f, g)(s_1).$$

Therefore g^* is a maximizer of the game (DGP$_{\theta^*}$). □

From Theorem 4.1, we can easily derive the following result.

Corollary 4.2. *Suppose that* $(f^*, g^*) \in F \times G$ *is a saddle point of the game* (*DFG*). *Then we have*

(1) $T_{\theta^*}(f^*, g^*)(s_1) = 0$ *and*
(2) (f^*, g^*) *is a saddle point of the game* (DGP_{θ^*}).

A theorem similar to Theorem 4.1 is given as follows.

Theorem 4.3. *Suppose that* $f^* \in F$ *is a minimizer of the game* (*DFG*). *Then we have*

(1) $\bar{\theta}(s_1) = \underline{\theta}(s_1) = \theta^*(s_1)$ *and*
(2) *if* $\underline{T}_{\theta^*}(s_1) \geqslant 0$, *then* f^* *is a minimizer of the game* (DGP_{θ^*}).

Proof. (1) Clearly, $\underline{\theta}(s_1) \leqslant \bar{\theta}(s_1)$. On the other hand, if $f^* \in F$ is a minimizer of the game (DFG), then

$$\underline{\theta}(s_1) = \sup_{g \in G} W(f^*, g)(s_1) \geqslant \inf_{f \in F} \sup_{g \in G} W(f, g)(s_1) = \bar{\theta}(s_1).$$

This implies that $\bar{\theta}(s_1) = \underline{\theta}(s_1) = \theta^*(s_1)$.

(2) Since $f^* \in F$ is a minimizer of the game (DFG), it follows that

$$\theta^*(s_1) = \sup_{g \in G} W(f^*, g)(s_1) \geqslant W(f^*, g)(s_1) \quad \text{for all } g \in G.$$

This implies that

$$U(f^*, g)(s_1) - \theta^* V(f^*, g)(s_1) \leqslant 0,$$
$$0 \geqslant \sup_{g} T_{\theta^*}(f^*, g)(s_1) \geqslant \inf_{f} \sup_{g} T_{\theta^*}(f, g)(s_1) = \underline{T}_{\theta^*}(s_1) \geqslant 0.$$

Hence

$$\sup_{g \in G} \underline{T}_{\theta^*}(f^*, g)(s_1) = \inf_{f \in F} \sup_{g \in G} \underline{T}_{\theta^*}(f, g)(s_1) = \underline{T}_{\theta^*}(s_1),$$

and f^* is a minimizer of (DGP_θ). $\square$

Theorem 4.4. *Suppose that* $\bar{\theta}(s_1) = \underline{\theta}(s_1) = \theta^*(s_1)$.

(1) *If* $g^* \in G$ *is a maximizer of the game* (DGP_{θ^*}) *with*

$$\inf_{f \in F} T_{\theta^*}(f, g^*)(s_1) = \bar{T}_{\theta^*}(s_1) \geqslant 0,$$

then g^* *is a maximizer of the game* (*DFG*).

(2) *If* $f^* \in F$ *is a minimizer of* (DGP_{θ^*}) *with*

$$\sup_{g \in G} T_{\theta^*}(f^*, g)(s_1) = \underline{T}_{\theta^*}(s_1) \leqslant 0,$$

then f^* *is a minimizer of the game* (*DFG*).

Proof. (1) By the assumptions, $\bar{T}_{\theta^*}(s_1) \geqslant 0$ and g^* is a maximizer of the game (DGP$_{\theta^*}$), it follows that

$$0 \leqslant \inf_{f\in F} \sup_{g\in G} T_{\theta^*}(f,g)(s_1) = \inf_{f\in F} T_{\theta^*}(f,g^*)(s_1) \leqslant T_{\theta^*}(f,g^*)(s_1) \quad \text{for all } f \in F.$$

This implies that

$$\theta^*(s_1) \leqslant W(f,g^*)(s_1) \leqslant \sup_{g\in G} W(f,g)(s_1) \quad \text{for all } f \in F.$$

Hence

$$\theta^*(s_1) \leqslant \inf_{f\in F} W(f,g^*)(s_1) \leqslant \inf_{f\in F} \sup_{g\in G} W(f,g)(s_1) = \bar{\theta}^*(s_1).$$

This shows that g^* is a maximizer of the game (DFG).

(2) The proof follows the same lines as the proof given for (1). □

From Theorem 4, we easily conclude the following theorem.

Theorem 4.5. *Suppose that $\bar{\theta}(s_1) = \underline{\theta}(s_1) = \theta^*(s_1)$, and that $(f^*, g^*) \in F \times G$ is a saddle point of the game (DGP$_{\theta^*}$) with $T_{\theta^*}(f^*, g^*)(s_1) = 0$. Then (f^*, g^*) is a saddle point of the game (DFG).*

5. A remark for further development

The objective function of a fractional dynamic game is of the form

$$W(x,y) = \frac{U(x,y)}{V(x,y)}, \quad x \in X,\ y \in Y. \tag{$\star$}$$

Our problem is to show that following inf–sup problem $(*)$ has zero dual gap under certain conditions. That is a minimax problem

$$\inf_{x\in X} \sup_{y\in Y} W(x,y) = \sup_{y\in Y} \inf_{x\in X} W(x,y), \tag{$*$}$$

where X and Y denote the universal strategy spaces in the sense of measurable transition probabilities. If X and Y are assumed to be nondiscrete compact strategy spaces for players I and II, then a question arises in the mathematical analysis for deterministic situations that under what conditions on the denominator and the numerator functions, $V(x,y)$ and $U(x,y)$, the fractional functional $W(x,y)$ will have a saddle point? There are many authors who investigated this problem deriving minimax theorems with respect to a two-variable function in x and y; see, for example, [3,6–8]. An excellent reference paper may refer to Fan [3] for nonfractional case. While some special minimax theorems in fractional cases, one can consult Lai et al. [6–8], these papers in minimax fractional programming are taking x to be discrete as counting functions of y. Further problems are implicit in the fractional functional $W(x,y)$.

Acknowledgment

The author expreses his sincere thanks to Professor Jerzy A. Filar and referee for their valuable comments.

References

[1] J.P. Crouzeix, J.A. Ferland, S. Schaible, Duality in generalized linear fractional programming, Math. Programming 27 (1983) 342–354.
[2] J.P. Crouzeix, J.A. Ferland, S. Schaible, An algorithm for generalized fractional programs, J. Optim. Theory Appl. 47 (1985) 35–49.
[3] K. Fan, Minimax theorems, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA 39 (1953) 42–47.
[4] R. Jagannathan, S. Schaible, Duality in generalized fractional programming via Farkas's lemma, J. Optim. Theory Appl. 41 (1983) 417–424.
[5] Y. Kimura, Y. Sawasaki, K. Tanaka, A perturbation on two-person zero-sum games, Anal. Dynam. Games 5 (2000) 279–288.
[6] H.C. Lai, J.C. Liu, On minimax fractional programming of generalized convex set functions, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 244 (2000) 442–465.
[7] H.C. Lai, J.C. Liu, K. Tanaka, Necessary and sufficient conditions for minimax fractional programming, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 230 (1999) 311–328.
[8] H.C. Lai, J.C. Liu, K. Tanaka, Duality without a constraint qualification for minimax fractional programming, J. Optim. Theory Appl. 101 (1999) 109–125.
[9] H.C. Lai, K. Tanaka, Non-cooperative n-person game with a stopped set, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 85 (1982) 153–171.
[10] H.C. Lai, K. Tanaka, On an N-person noncooperative Markov game with a metric state space, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 101 (1984) 78–96.
[11] H.C. Lai, K. Tanaka, A noncooperative n-person semi-Markov game with a metric state space, Appl. Math. Optim. 11 (1984) 23–42.
[12] H.C. Lai, K. Tanaka, On a D-solution of a cooperative m-person discounted Markov game, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 115 (1986) 578–591.
[13] H.C. Lai, K. Tanaka, An N-person noncooperative discounted vector-valued dynamic game with a metric space, Appl. Math. Optim. 16 (1987) 135–148.
[14] H.C. Lai, K. Tanaka, An n-person noncooperative discounted vector valued dynamic game with a stopped set, Comput. Math. Appl. 13 (1987) 227–237.
[15] H.C. Lai, K. Tanaka, Average-time criterion for vector-valued Markovian decision systems, Nihonkai Math. J. 2 (1991) 71–91.
[16] H.C. Lai, K. Tanaka, On continuous-time discounted stochastic dynamic programming, Appl. Math. Optim. 23 (1991) 155–169.
[17] A.S. Nowak, Existence of optimal strategies in zero-sum nonstationary stochastic games with lack of information on both sides, SIAM J. Control Optim. 27 (1989) 289–295.
[18] M. Schäl, Stochastic nonstationary two-person zero-sum games, Z. Angew. Math. Mech. 61 (1981) 352–353.
[19] S. Schaible, Fractional programming, in: R. Horst, P.M. Pardalos (Eds.), Handbook of Global Optimization, Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht, 1995, pp. 495–608.
[20] I.M. Stancu-Minasian, Fractional Programming Theory, Methods and Applications, in: Mathematics and Its Application, vol. 409, Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht, 1997.
[21] K. Tanaka, H.C. Lai, A two-person zero-sum Markov game with a stopped set, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 86 (1982) 54–68.
[22] K. Tanaka, K. Yokoyama, On ε-equilibrium point in a noncooperative n-person game, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 160 (1991) 413–423.